

specific strategy to fight drug abuse in our schools, our workplaces and our homes.

A few weeks ago, I was pleased to hear the White House drug policy chief Barry McCaffrey's harsh words of criticism for the liberal drug policies he observed while traveling through Europe. General McCaffrey strongly criticized the approach of the Netherlands, where marijuana and other drugs are legal, and called the result of their policies "an unmitigated disaster."

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no doubt that legalizing marijuana would have disastrous results for any society. General McCaffrey pointed that there are now over 1200 "pot clubs" in Holland alone. Crime has risen and the state is now responsible for thousands of heroin addicts that now require extensive methadone treatment.

According to today's Washington Post, General McCaffrey has once again modified his remarks and is now calling the drug policies of countries like Holland "very impressive." Mr. Speaker, I know General McCaffrey is tough on drugs. We've heard his 'zero' approach time and time again and I applaud him for that. However, I believe General McCaffrey was right when he first offered his opinion on policies of nations like the Netherlands when it comes to drugs.

Mr. Speaker, this Administration continues to send mixed signals on casual drug use. Meanwhile, children all over America are faced with the temptation to try drugs every day.

Those nations that choose to tolerate recreational drug use are going down a very dangerous path. The statistics of drug-related health problems and death in those countries can not be disputed. Mr. Speaker, it's time for this Administration to stop worrying about criticizing our friends in Europe and start worrying about the protection and welfare of our own children.

[From the Washington Post, Tues. July 21, 1998]

**DRUG CHIEF MITIGATES SLAP AT DUTCH
AFTER TOUR, MCCAFFREY SOFTENS HIS
CRITICISM OF DRUG POLICIES**

By Michael Grunwald

Less than two weeks ago, White House drug policy chief Barry R. McCaffrey sparked an international stir by attacking Dutch drug-fighting policies as "an unmitigated disaster." Yesterday, he offered a new description of their efforts: "very impressive."

McCaffrey is still no fan of the permissive Dutch attitude toward marijuana, and he was appalled by a "heroin provision" experiment for addicts he saw during a one-day dash through the Netherlands last week. But he said he was pleasantly surprised by aggressive Dutch efforts to rein in drug smuggling, "drug tourism" and drug-related violence.

He even said that the United States could learn a great deal from the expansive Dutch approach to funding drug treatment, especially methadone programs for heroin users.

"I am envious of their ability to deliver drug treatment and health care to heroin addicts," said McCaffrey, director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy. "Our program is inadequate in coverage."

It was quite a change of tune for McCaffrey, who made front-page news in the Netherlands with his "unmitigated disaster" comment during a July 9 appearance on a CNN talk show. McCaffrey said on the program that Dutch acceptance of marijuana as a harmless "soft drug" has fueled dramatic

increases in crime and warned that official toleration of nearly 1,200 "cannabis clubs" in the Netherlands was setting a terrible example for Europe. The Dutch ambassador to the United States, Joris Vos, responded that he was "confounded and dismayed" by McCaffrey's remarks.

McCaffrey, a four-star general who served with distinction in the Vietnam War and the Persian Gulf War, has courted controversy since President Clinton named him to lead America's war on drugs in 1996. He was a bitter critic of needle exchange programs, then muted his criticism somewhat after Clinton endorsed them as a useful tool against AIDS. He praised Mexico's top anti-drug official, Gen. Jesus Gutierrez Rebollo, as "an honest man," then professed shock when Gutierrez was arrested in a corruption sting after just 10 weeks in office.

Yesterday, in a news conference about his week-long swing through six European countries, McCaffrey acknowledged that he had overstepped with his "unmitigated disaster" criticism of the Dutch. "In a more balanced vein, I'd suggest that there are areas of agreement and areas of disagreement," he said. "Friends can disagree with friends."

Dutch officials yesterday said they welcomed his more conciliatory tone. "I think he made a good visit and learned a lot," said embassy spokeswoman Madelien DePlanque. "He doesn't agree with everything we do, but he's entitled to an opinion."

McCaffrey visited a methadone program in Amsterdam and said he came away impressed by the ease with which Dutch heroin addicts can get treatment. In America, he said, methadone clinics are few and far between, and addicts who do find them often face a maze of bureaucratic obstacles; only 115,000 of the estimated 800,000 U.S. heroin addicts currently get methadone.

McCaffrey also said he now believes that the Dutch are doing an "excellent job" cracking down on serious drug crimes and getting tough with "drug-daze" foreign tourists who visit the country for its marijuana-selling "coffee shops."

But McCaffrey is not quite ready for America to go Dutch when it comes to drug abuse. He criticized the toleration of cannabis clubs as "legal hypocrisy." He distributed statistics indicating dramatic across-the-board increases in crime and drug-related deaths in the Netherlands since 1978. He said he was disturbed by his visit with Rotterdam scientists who are dispensing heroin to 750 addicts. And he warned that "this beautiful, clean, quiet little country" has become a production and distribution hub for much of the European drug trade.

"They just haven't connected their problems to their attitudes towards drug abuse," McCaffrey said. "They seem to think marijuana is benign. It's not benign."

McCaffrey refused to visit a cannabis club, explaining that he already knows what people look like when they smoke pot. But he's done calling Dutch policy an "unmitigated disaster."

"You can say it's a mitigated disaster," he said.

**RELATING TO THE IMPORTANCE
OF JAPANESE AMERICAN RELATIONS**

SPEECH OF

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge support for H. Res. 392, relating to the impor-

tance of Japanese-American relations and the urgent need for Japan to more effectively address its economic and financial problems. I am an original cosponsor of this resolution as Ranking Member on the Asia and Pacific Subcommittee of the International Relations Committee.

One reason for this resolution was our appreciation of the vital contribution Japan makes as the world's second largest economy, to global economic growth, especially to the Asian Pacific region. The importance of maintaining the vitality of our security relationship with Japan in all its dimensions—economic, political, and military—is critical to American policy in the region. When Japan suffers, we suffer. When Asia is sick, Japan becomes ill too.

Curing one means helping both. We need that cure for our economic benefit. As one witness before the Subcommittee, Robert Grondine of the American Chamber of Commerce in Japan, pointed out, the Chamber represents over one thousand American companies doing business in Japan. It is in our economic self-interest to see a growing Japanese economy.

For many years, Japanese prosperity has permitted it to evade the need for the profound economic reforms which have been so obvious to both Japanese and foreign observers.

While there has been much discussion about the need for economic stimulus which will accelerate consumer demand, I am more interested in seeing the type of structural reform which will result in lasting economic change in Japan. Reform of the financial sector and greater market access for foreign competitors are particularly important.

I am confident that Japan will surmount its difficulties. The resilience and capability of the Japanese people have been proven through many times of trial.

In introducing H. Res. 391, Mr. BEREUTER and I hope that we will further the constructive economic dialog between our two countries in a way that deepens our ties.

**NORTHERN IRELAND VISA FOR
PEACE AND RECONCILIATION**

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1998

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Friends of Ireland and member of the Ad-Hoc Committee for Irish Affairs, I am inviting all of my colleagues to join us as cosponsors of the Northern Ireland Visa for Peace and Reconciliation.

Over the last few weeks, the world has witnessed events symbolizing both the hope for the future in Northern Ireland and the tragedy of its past. The politics of the gun has been replaced with the politics of the ballot box. A majority of men and women on all sides of the conflict have given their overwhelming support for the Good Friday Agreement and stood together in condemnation of last week's violence and murder. This initiative is aimed at helping those who are working for a new beginning.

In May, the Speaker of the Irish Dail, Mr. Seamus Pattison, led a delegation to Washington for a meeting of the U.S.-Ireland Interparliament. During those meetings, the Irish

continually raised the idea of a new U.S. transitional visa program designed to support the implementation of the peace agreement.

The Northern Ireland Visa for Peace and Reconciliation creates a non-immigrant, temporary working visa category targeted at individuals from disadvantaged areas in Northern Ireland and Border Counties of the Republic. It would allow young unskilled people from disadvantaged areas a brief period of time to learn a craft, get a temporary job and experience the diversity of the United States. After their visit, they would return home ready to share the benefits derived from working in the world's greatest economy.

In the past several years, we have seen 800 years of Irish history take a dramatic shift toward peace. We believe this Visa program will further cement that progress. I hope all Members will join us in supporting this low-risk, low-cost, high-return investment in support of peace in Northern Ireland.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1998

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, on July 20, the House considered several measures under suspension of the rules. On rollcall votes 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, and 308 had I been present I would have voted "yea."

On this date, I was representing the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property at a meeting of the National Music Publishers Association. I had committed to participating in this event prior to the scheduling of votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1998

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably detained and missed four rollcall votes (297, 298, 299 and 300). If I had been present, I would have voted "aye" on all four votes.

PRESENTATION TO THE CONSTITUTION SUBCOMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1998

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JOSEPH R. PITTS ON LETHAL DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION ACT, (H.R. 4006), JULY 14, 1998

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to speak in support of H.R. 4006, the

Lethal Drug Abuse Prevention Act of 1998. This bill will prohibit the dispensing or distribution of a controlled substance in order to cause or assist suicide or euthanasia.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly believe that we can and must do better for our disabled and ill citizens than kill them. You cannot solve problems by getting rid of the people to whom the problems happen. When a teenager says her life is not worth living because she has lost her boyfriend, we don't say, "Well, that's her choice." We recognize it as a cry for help, as a view that can and will be changed.

Statistics show that of those who attempt suicide and are stopped, less than 5% have gone on to kill themselves five years later. What a tragedy it would be for the more than 95% who survived if we had turned our backs and not tried to stop them from taking their lives. Sadly, that is exactly what opponents of H.R. 4006 seek to do.

I know that it will be said it is different for those who are terminally ill. But a study published in the American Journal of Psychiatry found that of the 24% who are terminally ill who said they wanted to die, all were suffering from clinically diagnosable depression. Depression is an illness, and it distorts judgment. We should treat it in terminally ill individuals as much as in others.

Let no one suppose, however, that this is an issue that applies only to the terminally ill. Authorizing assisted suicide for those with terminal illness is only the tip of the iceberg. We can see what happened in the Netherlands. In 1981, a Dutch court said that under certain conditions, a doctor could assist a terminally ill person's suicide. In 1982, another court extended that to elderly people who were not terminally ill, but in chronic bad health, a decision upheld by the Dutch Supreme Court in 1984. In 1986, the Dutch Supreme Court said that people with disabilities could be killed.

In 1989 Holland moved from voluntary assisted suicide to nonvoluntary euthanasia when the Supreme Court said that doctors could give lethal injections to children born with Down syndrome. In 1991 a Dutch court legitimized killing a 25 year old woman with mental illness, and in 1994 the Supreme Court said that a woman, with no physical illness or disability, but who was depressed because of the death of her last remaining child, could be killed.

Once you accept the view that death is a solution to human problems, it becomes very hard to draw lines. Gradually, it will be seen as an answer to more and more problems, for less and less weighty reasons. We in America must not start down that road.

My colleagues from Oregon argue that Congress has no business in this area, that it should be left entirely up to the state of Oregon. They miss the point that we are talking about federally controlled drugs. Under existing federal law, it is generally illegal to dispense or distribute these drugs unless you have a special license or "registration" from the federal government. If you are a medical practitioner or pharmacist, you are granted that federal registration to prescribe certain of these federally controlled substances for a legitimate medical purpose.

Congress passed the Controlled Substances Act in the first place because drug abuse is a national problem. A state cannot nullify the federal law if it chooses, as a matter of state law, to legalize the use of heroin or LSD. The same Attorney General who overturned the ruling of the professionals at the federal Drug Enforcement Administration on this matter has successfully gotten injunctions to close cannabis clubs in California

that were selling marijuana for supposed medicinal purposes as authorized by a California referendum.

Mr. Chairman, you can't have it both ways. If my distinguished colleagues from Oregon really want to assert states' rights, they should be pushing for the complete repeal of the federal Controlled Substances Act. But while it is in effect, for the federal government to permit the dispensing of otherwise prohibited federally controlled drugs to kill patients means the federal government is affirmatively facilitating assisted suicide.

The American people don't want this to happen, by a margin of more than 2 to 1. A Wirthlin Worldwide poll in March found that 65% oppose allowing the use of "federally controlled drugs for the purpose of assisted suicide and euthanasia."

Mr. Chairman, the Declaration of Independence describes life as something that is "inalienable"—a right so fundamental that it cannot be given away even voluntarily. The principal author of the Declaration, Thomas Jefferson, wrote in 1809 that "The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

Our country stands at a crossroads between the way of death and the way of life. I urge that this subcommittee lead us in the life-affirming direction by reporting out the Lethal Drug Abuse Prevention Act of 1998.

TRIBUTE TO KELLY RITTER

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1998

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Kelly Ritter of Darlington, South Carolina, on the fiftieth anniversary of his involvement in the tobacco business. Mr. Ritter is a well-known figure in the South Carolina tobacco community, and the State has greatly benefitted from his commitment to improving both the quality of our fields and the well-being of the persons whose lives revolve around tobacco crops.

Originally from North Carolina, Mr. Ritter attended North Carolina State University. He entered the United States Army Corps following college, and joined the troops headed to fight in World War II. Just as he was finishing his last bombing missions in Germany, Mr. Ritter was shot down in his plane. He was captured by the Germans and held as a Prisoner of War for 485 days.

After the war, Mr. Ritter moved from Lumberton, North Carolina, to Darlington, South Carolina. He became very involved in the local community, serving as an elder in the Presbyterian Church in Darlington, where he is still a Member. President of the South Carolina Tobacco Warehouse Association, Mr. Ritter acted as a liaison between tobacco companies and farmers, and he worked diligently to improve the tobacco industry and help those involved in it. He has also served on a number of other federal and state tobacco committees.

In addition to his demonstrated commitment to the tobacco industry, Mr. Ritter is also a dedicated husband and father. He has been